

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE 597

THE NATION  
16 MAY 1981

# EXCHANGE.

## McCarthyism of the Left?

Theodore J. Lowi

Ithaca, N.Y.

*The Nation* has a long and admirable history of keeping America alert to abuses of power. But is its sense of responsibility now so great and its capacities so limited that it must publish articles based on false information, false premises, McCarthyish innuendo and guilt by association? Given my respect for *The Nation* and for Alan Wolfe, I cannot imagine how either could justify publishing the attack on Jeane Kirkpatrick in "Jeane's Designs," February 7.

In the first place, Lyman Kirkpatrick and Evron Kirkpatrick, Jeane's husband, are not brothers. A quick reference to *Who's Who* would have told you that Lyman was the son of Lyman and Lyde Kirkpatrick, born in Rochester, New York, while Evron was the son of Omer and Lenna Mae Kirkpatrick, born near Raub, Indiana. If you want to make brothers out of them, you have to be prepared to argue that their *Who's Who* biographies were faked in order to hide from all but the most discerning investigators evidence of their relationship.

On the second point, Operations and Policy Research Inc. was a Central Intelligence Agency front about the same way the old Institute for Pacific Relations was a Russian Communist front. The issue to which Wolfe refers was a revelation in 1967 that one or more pamphlets on government and politics published by that organization were subsidized by the C.I.A. in order to encourage a larger printing and a wider circulation of some rather inane and harmless materials. It was wrong for that organization to have accepted the subvention without revealing the source. But if that organization became a C.I.A. front on that basis, so did the venerable M.I.T. Press and the National Students Association.

Incidentally, when the C.I.A. subvention was revealed, I was one of a very large number of political scientists who screamed and yelled in criticism of it and was chairman of the first public hearing on the whole issue of ethics in the profession, which took place at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association in Lafayette, Indiana. There is no record of a motion calling upon Evron Kirkpatrick to sever his connections with the C.I.A. nor is there a record of a motion praising his patriotism. There is instead a record of an American Political Science Association (A.P.S.A.) committee being appointed to look into the issue and a report published in *PS* in the winter of 1968. Accepting any such subvention knowingly and without reviewing the source is conduct deserving of criticism—which indeed was showered upon Kirkpatrick at that time. But it is in no way evidence confirming an argument that Kirkpatrick was a secret C.I.A. agent or that the organization in question was a C.I.A. front. McCarthyism of the left.

An even purer case of McCarthyism of the left was Wolfe's use of facts in a manner to suggest guilt or guilt by association. It is a fact that Evron Kirkpatrick supported Hubert Humphrey; and it is a fact that Kirkpatrick moved to Washington the same year as did Senator Humphrey. It is also a fact that Humphrey was then a vociferous anti-Communist. But these facts are placed in such a manner in the paragraph as to appear to be evidence to confirm still further the C.I.A. reactionary, conspiratorial connection. Did all anti-Communists become secret C.I.A. agents? Is this true of Humphrey? Was it true of all of the activists in the American Veterans Committee?

Another set of facts that are utilized in the same McCarthy-like argument has to do with political scientists who go to serve in the government. It begins with the suggestion that Evron Kirkpatrick's entry into the govern-

know what other political scientists Wolfe would be willing to except from his general rule, but I would be happy to provide him with a long list of political scientists who have served in the government so that we could rebuild the A.P.S.A. on the basis of those who can get clearance from Alan Wolfe. As for Hans Morgenthau, I would like to take the liberty of making an observation on the basis of the seven years during the bad old 1960s when we were colleagues and friends at the University of Chicago. I agree with Wolfe that Morgenthau was a man of absolutely incorruptible integrity. I also agree that it was a shame he was never elected president of the A.P.S.A. But his commitment to the truth had nothing to do with the absence of his service in American government or the absence of his desire to be close to people in power. Quite the contrary. Morgenthau had many close associates in the State Department and elsewhere, and he enjoyed very much his association with them and the feeling that he was influential with them. He was never bitter about not having been president of the A.P.S.A., but he was very bitter about being dropped as a regular consultant with the State Department when he began to criticize their Vietnam policies. According to the criterion set down by Wolfe in his article, everything Morgenthau wrote or said prior to the late 1960s must be put under a shadow of great suspicion because he was very close to power, and he enjoyed it.

Are we, on this basis, to believe that Jeane Kirkpatrick is a power-oriented opportunist because she is married to a secret C.I.A. agent and because she was a cold warrior in the 1960s? Are we to believe that she wrote the sort of things she did because she had special knowledge in 1979 that Ronald Reagan would be elected President of the United States and would read her *Com-*

**CONTINUED**